



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/437,489	11/10/1999	HIROHIKO ISHII	99224	8040

7590 02/10/2003

SCOTT T WAKEMAN
DENNISON MESEROLE SCHEINER & SCHULTZ
1745 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY STE 612
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

KIM, DAVID S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2633

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)
	09/437,489		ISHII, HIROHIKO
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David Kim	2633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5 and 6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2633

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claim 1** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. Rosenberg discloses an IR communication device comprising:

a substrate;

an infrared rays receiving element mounted on the substrate at a position on the X-line;

a first lens provided on an infrared rays emitting element; and

a semispherical second lens provided on the infrared rays receiving element;

(Rosenberg, col. 2, lines 50-57, Figs. 3a-3d).

Rosenberg does not disclose:

a plurality of infrared rays emitting elements mounted on the substrate and arranged on an X-line;

the first lens elongated in a direction of the X-line;

the first lens having an elongated convex shape having two convex opposing end portions, and having a length longer than a length of the arrangement of the infrared rays emitting elements so as to expand infrared rays radiation range in the direction of the X-line over the two convex opposing end portions of X-line of first lens.

However, Yamana et al. discloses such a plurality of elements (Yamana et al., light-emitting diode chips 2 in Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 1-2) and first lens (Yamana et al., col. 3, lines 21-36, Fig. 2) having two convex opposing end portions (Yamana et al., convex opposing end portions

Art Unit: 2633

of cylindrical lens 4 in Fig. 1), and having a length longer than a length of the arrangement of the infrared rays emitting elements so as to expand infrared rays radiation range in the direction of the X-line. At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the plurality of elements and first lens of Yamana et al. in the device of Rosenberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since "light rays which have passed through that surface [lens] portion are collected more closely along the optical axis of the lens" (Yamana et al., col. 4, lines 3-5, Figs. 2 and 8). This increased collection of light rays along the optical axis of the lens enables one to focus the light rays in a particular direction with less scatter toward peripheral directions. Additionally, the plurality of elements of Yamana et al. would increase the light intensity of the light-emitting portion of Rosenberg. Such an increase in light intensity would also increase the transmission range of the device of Rosenberg.

Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. does not expressly disclose expanding infrared rays radiation range over the two convex opposing end portions of X-line of first lens. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would notice that infrared rays (from the plurality of infrared rays emitting elements) incident at the first lens surface of Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. would inherently refract. In particular, some infrared rays would refract over the two convex opposing end portions of X-line of first lens, inherently expanding infrared rays radiation range in the direction of the X-line over the two convex opposing end portions of X-line of first lens.

3. **Claim 2** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Yamana et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Amano. Rosenberg and Yamana et al. disclose all the limitations of claim 2 except for said first lens having a semi-cylindrical shape. However, Amano teaches such a lens having a semi-cylindrical shape (see Figs. 9). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the semi-cylindrical shape of Amano for the lens of Yamana et al. in the

Art Unit: 2633

device of Rosenberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since "light rays which have passed through that surface [lens] portion are collected more closely along the optical axis of the lens" (Yamana et al., col. 4, lines 3-5, Figs. 2 and 8). This increased collection of light rays along the optical axis of the lens enables one to focus the light rays in a particular direction with less scatter toward peripheral directions.

4. **Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg and Yamana et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Fujimura et al. Rosenberg and Yamana et al. disclose all the limitations of claim 3 except for said first lens having an elongated semi-spherical shape. However, Fujimura et al. teaches such a lens having an elongated semi-spherical shape (see Drawings 1-3 and section "Detailed Description," items 0011 and 0014-0016). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the elongated semi-spherical shape of Fujimura et al. for the lens of Yamana et al. in the device of Rosenberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since "light rays which have passed through that surface [lens] portion are collected more closely along the optical axis of the lens" (Yamana et al., col. 4, lines 3-5, Figs. 2 and 8). This increased collection of light rays along the optical axis of the lens enables one to focus the light rays in a particular direction with less scatter toward peripheral directions.

5. **Claim 5** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. Rosenberg discloses all the limitations of claim 5 except for a lens having an elongated convex shape provided on a light-emitting element wherein the lens is elongated in a horizontal direction. However, Yamana et al. teaches a lens having an elongated convex shape provided on a light-emitting element (see treatment of claim 1 above) wherein the lens is elongated in a horizontal direction (Fig. 1). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a lens that is elongated in a horizontal direction in Rosenberg's device, as taught by Yamana et al. One of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2633

would have been motivated to do this to provide a “device for illuminating linear fields” (Yamana et al., col. 1, lines 8-9).

6. **Claim 6** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. Rosenberg discloses all the limitations of claim 6 except for a lens having an elongated convex shape provided on a light-emitting element and a reflective cup enclosing said lens. However, Yamana et al. teaches a lens having an elongated convex shape provided on a light-emitting element (see treatment of claim 1 above) and a reflective cup enclosing said lens (see Figs. 1-3 and the corresponding descriptions in col. 2, lines 55-60; col. 3, lines 10-20). At the time of the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a reflective cup enclosing the lens of Yamana et al. into Rosenberg's device, as taught by Yamana et al. One of ordinary skill in that art would have been motivated to do this since “light rays emitted sidewardly of the chip are reflected frontwardly by a convex mirror [cup] formed on the substrate integrally therewith. Therefore, light rays incident on the cylindrical lens within an effective range will increase, it being thus possible to achieve improved utilization of light” (Yamana et al., col. 4, lines 27-33).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed on 23 January 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. does not show the “first lens having an elongated convex shape with convex end portions at both ends” (paper no. 7, page 4). Also regarding claim 1, Applicant argues that Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. “teach [sic] away from the claimed invention, which requires expansion of the radiation range” (paper no. 7, page 4). Examiner respectfully disagrees. Yamana et al. shows a first lens having an elongated convex shape (Yamana et al., cylindrical lens 4 in Figs. 1 and 2) with convex end portions at both ends (Yamana et al., convex opposing end portions of

Art Unit: 2633

cylindrical lens 4 in Fig. 1). As discussed in the rejection of claim 1 above, the radiation range of the device of Rosenberg in view of Yamana et al. would inherently expand in the direction of the X-line over the two convex opposing end portions of X-line of first lens. Thus, Examiner respectfully maintains the standing rejection.

Regarding claim 2, Applicant argues, "the device of Amano is operable to make the outgoing light beams converge to form images at a focal point of the lens. Therefore, the Amano reference also clearly teaches away from the claimed invention" (paper no. 7, page 4).

Applicant's assertion that Amano teaches the converging of light beams is valid, but Examiner disagrees with the conclusion that Amano teaches away from the claimed invention. Examiner submits that Figs. 4, 11, and 12 of Amano would teach away from the claimed invention.

However, Fig. 9 of Amano does not teach away from an expanded radiation range, as anticipated in the rejection of claim 1 above. Thus, Examiner respectfully maintains the standing rejection.

Regarding claims 3, 5, and 6, claims 3, 5, and 6 are dependent on claim 1, and Applicant only argues for their allowance based on the condition of claim 1. In view of the standing rejection of claim 1, Examiner respectfully maintains the standing rejections of claims 3, 5, and 6.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Kim whose telephone number is 703-305-6457. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9 AM to 5 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on 703-305-4729. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2633

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4750.

DSK
February 5, 2003



JASON CHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600